

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached “Replacement Sheets” of drawings include changes to Figure 1.

The attached “Replacement Sheets,” which include Figures 1-5, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 12, and 15 are now pending in the application. Claim 15 has been added as new. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings have been amended to include reference numerals added to the specification. Specifically, reference numerals 105 and 106 have been added to Figure 1.

SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to include further description for the drawings as originally filed. Specifically, reference numerals 105 and 106 have been added at paragraph [0017] to correspond to amended Figure 1. Additionally, description has been added at paragraph [0019], as indicated above, regarding the extent of cords 200, 201 along the length of the elastomer body. This material is shown in the drawings as originally filed and therefore does not constitute new matter.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmuth, II et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,741,517, hereinafter “Warmuth”) in view of Hirtreiter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,897,941, hereinafter “Hirtreiter”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to include “an elastomer body having first and second ends configured to be coupled to first and second structures” and to specify that the first and second cords extend “from said first end to said second end.” The Examiner agrees with Applicant that “Warmuth failed to disclose the helix angle of the first cord is greater than the helix angle of the second cord.” The Examiner has combined Hirtreiter with Warmuth, stating that Hirtreiter teaches the helix angle of the first cord being greater than the helix angle of the second cord. However, in view of the amendments to claim 1, Applicant submits that this combination does not teach the limitations of claim 1.

Specifically, the portion of Hirtreiter cited by the Examiner as teaching this differential helix angle (col. 8, lines 1-8) concerns cords 17. Cords 17 are part of reinforcement 16, which is part of connecting portion 13. As clearly seen in Figure 1, connecting portion 13 does not extend the length of body 2. Specifically, portion 13 as shown in Figure 1 stops short of extending to either end. As indicated in Hirtreiter, “[t]he body 2 includes a flexing portion 11 at one peripheral end 12 thereof and a non-flexing generally cylindrical connecting portion 13 extending longitudinally or axially of the member 1 between the flexing portion 11 and the opposite peripheral end portion 14 thereof to join or connect these portions.” (col. 4, lines 42-47). As such, Hirtreiter cannot be seen as teaching the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 requires the first and second cords to extend to the first and second ends of the elastomer body. With the first and second ends being coupled to first and second structures, the first and second cords provide for the transmission of a torsional load through the cords, which cannot be done as effectively by the teachings of Hirtreiter.

The teachings of claim 1 provide for a balance of torque experienced by the first and second cords due to the smaller radius of the first cord disposed radially inwardly of the second cord. There does not appear to be any teaching in Hirtreiter of the cords of amended claim 1 nor does there appear to be any motivation to modify Warmuth to create the air spring sleeve of claim 1 in view of Hirtreiter.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-3, 12, and 15 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 12 are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 15 has been added as new. Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and should therefore be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug. 9, 2006

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

Correspondence Address

Ronald W. Wangerow, Reg. No. 29,597
FREUDENBERG-NOK GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
Legal Department
47690 East Anchor Court
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455
Direct Line: (734) 354-5445
Facsimile: (734) 451-1445